

### REMARKS

Claims 1-55 were submitted with the original application. Claims 56-69 were presented via a preliminary amendment filed on February 10, 2003 (a copy of the PTO receipt is attached herewith).

Claims 1-55 were examined and rejected. Claims 56-69 did not appear to be examined.

In response to the subject action, claims 6-8, 10, 16-17, 41-46, 53-55 and 67-69 have been cancelled, and claims 1-5, 9, 11-13, 15, 21-22, 24-25, 31, 33, 35, 37, 40, 47-52, 56-60 and 62-66 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-5, 9, 11-15, 18-40, 47-52, and 56-66 remain pending.

In the subject office action, claim 22 was rejected for being indefinite. Claim 22 has been amended accordingly overcoming the rejection.

Claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-15, 18-20, 41 and 44 were rejected as being unpatentable under §103(a) in view of Mitchell and Anderson combined. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1-2, 11-13, and 15, and cancelled claims 6-7, 41 and 44.

Accordingly, rejections of claims 6-7, 41 and 44 have been rendered moot.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitation of "the variable length encoding scheme having a plurality of codes of various code lengths including a first and a second code having a first and a second code length representing a phrase and a vowel respectively, and the first code length being shorter than the second code length". The recitation is neither taught or suggested by Mitchell and Anderson, individually or in combination. Accordingly claim 1 is patentable over Mitchell and Anderson combined.

Claims 2, 11-15, and 18-20 depend on claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 2, 11-15, and 18-20 are patentable over Mitchell and Anderson combined.

Claims 3, 42 and 45 were rejected as being unpatentable under §103(a) in view of Mitchell and Faucher combined. In response, Applicants have amended claim 3, and cancelled claims 42 and 45.

Accordingly, rejections of claims 42 and 45 have been rendered moot.

Faucher does not remedy the above described deficiency of Mitchell. Therefore, claim 1 remains patentable over Mitchell even when combined with Faucher.

Claim 3 depends on claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 3 is patentable over Mitchell and Anderson combined.

Claims 4, 5, 43 and 46 were rejected as being unpatentable under §103(a) in view of Mitchell, Anderson and Le Pechon combined. In response, Applicants have amended claims 4-5, and cancelled claims 43 and 46.

Accordingly, rejections of claims 43 and 46 have been rendered moot.

Le Pechon does not remedy the above described deficiency of Mitchell and Anderson. Therefore, claim 1 remains patentable over Mitchell and Anderson even when combined with Le Pechon.

Claims 4-5 depend on claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 4-5 are patentable over Mitchell, Anderson and Le Pechon combined.

Claims 8-10 were rejected as being unpatentable under §103(a) in view of Mitchell, Anderson and Tanaka combined. In response, Applicants have amended claim 9, and cancelled claims 8 and 10.

Accordingly, rejections of claims 8 and 10 have been rendered moot.

Le Pechon does not remedy the above described deficiency of Mitchell and Anderson. Therefore, claim 1 remains patentable over Mitchell and Anderson even when combined with Le Pechon.

Claim 9 depends on claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 9 is patentable over Mitchell, Anderson and Le Pechon combined.

Claims 16 and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable under §103(a) in view of Mitchell, Anderson and Lee combined. In response, Applicants have cancelled claims 16-17. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 16 and 17 have been rendered moot.

Claims 21-23 were rejected as being unpatentable under §103(a) in view of Mitchell and Le Pechon combined. In response, Applicants have amended claims 21 and 22. Claim 21 has been amended to include the recitation of “vibrationally output alphanumeric data ... through vibrational manifestation of encoded representations of the received alphanumeric data for touch comprehension”. Le Pechon teaches vibrational output for audible comprehension. Accordingly Le Pechon does not remedy the deficiency of Mitchell. Therefore, claim 21 is patentable over Mitchell and Le Pechon combined.

Claims 22-23 depend on claim 21 incorporating its limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 22-23 are patentable over Mitchell and Le Pechon combined.

Claim 24 was rejected as being unpatentable under §103(a) in view of Mitchell Le Pechon, and Anderson combined. In response, Applicants have amended claim 24. Anderson does not remedy the deficiency of Mitchell and Le Pechon. Therefore, claim 21 is patentable over Mitchell and Le Pechon, even when combined with Anderson.

Claim 24 depends on claim 21 incorporating its limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 24 is patentable over Mitchell, Le Pechon and Anderson combined.

Claims 25-30 were rejected as being unpatentable under §103(a) in view of Mitchell, Le Pechon, Anderson, and Tanaka combined. In response, Applicants have amended claims 21 and 25.

Tanaka does not remedy the deficiency of Mitchell, Le Pechon and Anderson, therefore, claim 21 remains patentable over Mitchell, Le Pechon and Anderson, even when combined with Tanaka.

Claim 25 depends on claim 21, incorporating its limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 25 is patentable over Mitchell, Le Pechon, Anderson and Tanaka combined.

Claim 25 has been amended to include the same recitation discussed above for claim 1. Tanaka teaches the employment of fixed length codes of 4-digit long to identify phrases, neither Mitchell, Anderson, Le Pechon nor Tanaka, individually or in combination, teaches or suggests a variable code length encoding scheme having codes of varying length to represent alphanumeric data as well as directly representing phrases of one or more words. Further, neither Mitchell, Anderson, LePechon nor Tanaka, individually or in combination, teaches or suggests such code scheme having at least one code representing a phrase with a code length that is shorted that a code presenting a vowel. It is well known that prior art coding scheme, such as Morse code, teaches the assignment of short code length to vowels as they are the more frequently used alphabets than consonants.

Therefore, claim 25 is patentable over Mitchell, Le Pechon, Anderson and Tanaka combined, further for this reason.

Claims 26-30 depend on claim 21, incorporating its limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 26-30 are patentable over Mitchell, Anderson, Le Pechon and Tanaka combined.

Claims 31-33, 36-39 and 40 were rejected as being unpatentable under §103(a) in view of Mitchell, Anderson and Faucher combined. In response, Applicants have amended claims 31, 33 and 40.

Claim 31 has been amended to include the recitation of "complementary logic in support of

entry of alphanumeric data through the input keypad,

entry of alphanumeric data through entry of encoded representation of the alphanumeric data using the at least first button, and

energizing said light source to light said at least first button to visually echo encoded representations of alphanumeric data entered through said input keypad".

Note that the recitation calls for the logic to support lighting the first keys to visual convey to a user the encoded representation of alphanumeric data enter via the keypad. For example, if the letter "A" is entered via the keypad, the first key may be lighted to show the Morse code representation of "A" is "ditdah". As explained in the specification, this may help a user in learning the code representations.

While Mitchell teaches entry of alphanumeric data via keypad, and LED disposed under key, and Anderson teaches entry of Morse code, neither Mitchell, Anderson, Facuher, individually or in combination, teaches or suggests, visually echoing of the code representation of alphanumeric data enter via a keypad on the special keys employed to enter the code representation.

Therefore, claim 31 is patentable over Mitchell, Anderson, and Faucher.

Claims 32-33, 36-39 and 40 depend on claim 31, incorporating its limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 32-33, 36-39 and 40 are patentable over Mitchell, Anderson and Faucher combined.

Claims 34 and 35 were rejected as being unpatentable under §103(a) in view of Mitchell, Anderson, Faucher and Tanaka combined. In response, Applicants have amended claims 31 and 35.

Tanaka does not remedy the above discussed deficiency of Mitchell, Anderson and Faucher, therefore, claim 31 remains patentable over Mitchell, Anderson and Faucher, even when combined with Tanaka.

Claims 34 and 35 depend from claim 31 incorporating its limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 34 and 35 are patentable over Mitchell, Anderson, Faucher and Tanaka combined.

Claims 47 and 48 were rejected as being unpatentable under §103(a) in view of Anderson and Mitchell. Claims 47-48 have been amended. Claim 47 has been amended with the same recitation earlier discussed for claim 1. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 47 is patentable over Anderson and Mitchell.

Claim 48 depends from claim 47 incorporating its limitation. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 48 is patentable over Mitchell and Anderson combined.

Claim 49 was rejected as being unpatentable under §103(a) in view of Anderson Mitchell, and Faucher. Claims 47 and 49 have been amended. Faucher does not remedy the above discussed deficiency of claim 47, therefore, claim 47 remains patentable over Anderson and Mitchell, even when combined with Faucher.

Claim 49 depends from claim 47 incorporating its limitation. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 49 is patentable over Mitchell, Anderson and Faucher combined.

Claim 50 was rejected as being unpatentable under §103(a) in view of Anderson Mitchell, and Le Pechon. Claims 47 and 50 have been amended. Le Pechon does not remedy the above discussed deficiency of claim 47, therefore, claim 47 remains patentable over Anderson and Mitchell, even when combined with Le Pechon.

Claim 50 depends from claim 47 incorporating its limitation. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 50 is patentable over Mitchell, Anderson and Le Pechon combined.

Claims 51-54 were rejected as being unpatentable under §103(a) in view of Keshavachar and Anderson. Claim 51 has been amend, and claims 53-54 have been cancelled.

Accordingly, rejections of claims 53-54 have been rendered moot by their cancellations.

Claim 51 has been amended with the same limitation earlier described for claim 1. Neither Keshavachar nor Anderson teaches or suggests the recitation. Therefore, for at least that reason, claim 51 is patentable over Keshavachar and Anderson combined.

Claim 52 depends from claim 51 incorporating its limitation. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 52 is patentable over Keshavachar nor Anderson combined.

Claim 55 was rejected as being unpatentable under §103(a) in view of Keshavachar, Anderson and Tanaka. Claim 55 has been cancelled. Accordingly, rejection of claim 55 has been rendered moot.

Claims 56-66 had not been rejected. Nonetheless in the interest of expeditiously brining prosecution on the merit to completion, Applicants have amended claims 56-60 and 62-66. These claims are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above for claims 1-5, 9, 11-15, 18-40 and 47-52.

In summary, remaining claims 1-5, 9, 11-15, 18-40, 47-52 and 56-66 are in condition of allowance. Early issuance of notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: April 4, 2005



---

Aloysius T.C. AuYeung  
Reg. No. 35,432

Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: 503-222-9981



Attorney's Docket No.: 109909-129558 Atty/Sec: ATA/RTW/hla  
Application No.: 09/975,287 Filing Date: October 10, 2001  
Title: WIRELESS MOBILE PHONE WITH ENCODED DATA ENTRY FACILITIES  
Client: Wildseed, Ltd. Inventor(s): Jonathan O. Nelson, et al.  
Date Mailed: February 5, 2003 Docket Date: \*\*

The following items have been received in the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office on the date stamped hereon:

<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Response (___pgs.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Info. Disc. Stmt./Form PTO-1449 (4 pgs.)
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Response After Final (___pgs.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Issue Fee Transmittal (1 pg. - in duplicate)
<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Brief & two copies (___pgs. each)	<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Appeal (___pgs.)
<input type="checkbox"/> Application: (___pgs.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition for Extension of Time: (___pgs.)
<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment and Cover Sheet (___pgs.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Amendment (5 pgs.)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certificate of Mailing	<input type="checkbox"/> Reply Brief (___pgs.)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Check No.: 71213 Amount: \$756	<input type="checkbox"/> Request & Certification Under 35 U.S.C. 122(b)(2)(B)(i) (1 pg.)
<input type="checkbox"/> Check No.: Amount:	<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Notice to File Missing Parts/PTO-1533 (___pgs.)
<input type="checkbox"/> Declaration/POA (___pgs.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt Postcard
<input type="checkbox"/> Discd. Docs. & Invs' Signed Ltr. (___pgs.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small Entity Status Claimed
<input type="checkbox"/> Drawings: ___ Sheets, ___ Figures	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Inquiry (___pgs.)
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Mail Label No.:	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Amendment (___pgs.)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal (1 pg. - in duplicate)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transmittal Letter (1 pg.)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Request to Change Attorney Docket Number (1 pg.)	

IPG No. 41051.P012X

